



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

VI.—*Elision, especially in Greek.*

By M. W. HUMPHREYS,

PROFESSOR OF GREEK IN VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY.

I propose, in this paper, to discuss the nature of elision in Greek; and, in so doing, I shall first examine the views of others, and then present my own.

Corssen, Westphal, Heinrich Ahrens, and many others, hold that elided vowels were not entirely suppressed, but merely diminished, and one argument they employ is that the Greek name itself, *συναλοιφή* or *σύγκρισις*, does not signify total expulsion, but implies that the vowels were united in a rapid pronunciation, and did not suffer what was called *ἐκθλιψις*, or expulsion. To this I reply: 1. That the ancient writers are not always to be interpreted literally; for, as one vowel, or rather one syllable, appeared to result from a combination of two, and the elided vowels *sometimes were* slightly sounded (a point to be explained hereafter), there was no reason why they should not, in a loose way, designate the process by the word *συναλοιφή*, or *σύγκρισις*, which does not necessarily mean anything more than “conjunction”; and besides, already at a tolerably early day they employed the term *ἐκθλιψις* to denote elision. Even modern writers are not exempt from much more inaccurate applications of terms than even *συναλοιφή* in the sense of elision, to say nothing of the other words. As, for instance, the German grammarians call final *m* and *n* in French a “Nachklang,” or “after-sound,” as if they were pronounced *after* the accompanying vowel, while every one knows that they merely give the entire vowel a nasal tone. Many illustrations of this could be cited, but this one must suffice.

2. Moreover, when the ancient grammarians speak of the suppression of hiatus, they frequently fail to distinguish between the various processes, or else between the words that denote them; and in the very passage cited by Corssen, elision is confounded with crasis. The passage is: “Ἔστι δὲ

συναλοιφή δύο φωνηέντων διηρημένων εἰς μίαν συλλαβὴν ἔνωσις, οἷον τὸ ὄνομα. τοῦνομα. If the metrician had not added his example, the inference would have been that *συναλοιφή* was always the *combination* of two vowels into one, whilst the example he gave shows that he had only crasis in mind when he cast his definition; and yet Corssen wishes to apply the definition to elision.

But as it is the custom of many now-a-days to dismiss the question of elision with the statement that Ahrens has shown it to have been only a partial expulsion, and as Ahrens has given about all the arguments for that view, I proceed to take up his arguments and examine them one by one. In the *first* place, Ahrens says that if elision is total, the letter immediately preceding the elided vowel closes the word as thus modified, and he calls attention to the fact that we then find not a few unpronounceable combinations, as ἔσθλ', σέμν', etc., and others which the Greeks would not tolerate, as νύκτ', πεῖδ', etc. But if, as he asserts, elision does combine two vowels into one, then the two words become one; and why then may we not be allowed to combine the words after *expelling* one of the vowels? And this is exactly what happens, except in some instances about which I shall presently speak. *Secondly*, Ahrens says that ἄλγε' ἔθηκεν, ἀντί' ἐμέϊο, and similar combinations, would still have a "hiatus offensionem, *quam non inesse constat*." How does he know? The Greeks did not suppress *two* syllables, by elision, because this would have maimed the word too severely, so there was nothing left them but to tolerate the new hiatus, as custom required them in poetry to remove the original hiatus. And besides, does Ahrens's diminution-theory remove his own difficulty? It seems to me to increase it, for who will pronounce ἄλγε^a ἔθηκεν for us (pronouncing the final *a* of ἄλγε^a, yet making it of inappreciable length)? And in ἀντί' ἐμέϊο there is surely a less offensive hiatus than in ἀντί^a ἐμέϊο. Moreover, it is a well-known fact that languages, in removing one hiatus, sometimes create another no less offensive; as, in Sanskrit vanê âsît is resolved into vanai âsît, and the *i* being elided, we have vana âsît, where the hiatus appears even worse than at first (Bopp,

Crit. Skt. Gram. § 38). But after all, I am willing to admit that there is nothing offensive in the remaining condition of things when elision has been made; for the two words are pronounced continuously, and the vocal muscles do not have to arrest themselves and then renew the exertion as they do in case of real hiatus.

Thirdly, Ahrens draws his conclusion from the scholia on EURIP. Or. 279:

Ἐκ κυμάτων γὰρ αἰθεῖς αἰ γαλήν' ὀρῶ.

The scholiasts on this passage (and also on ARISTOPH. Frogs, 304—not cited by Ahrens) say that Hegelochus, getting out of breath, passed rapidly over the elision, and the spectators thought he said γαλήν ὀρῶ, which circumstance gave Aristophanes (*Frogs*, 304), Strattis (*Anthroporrhæstes*), Sannyrion (*Danaë*), and others an opportunity to amuse their audience at the expense of Euripides and his great actor. But, as I shall show hereafter, when occasion demanded, the Greeks did sometimes slightly sound elided vowels, and one of the most natural places to do this is where ambiguity might result from *total* elision; and the statements of the scholiasts show that what Hegelochus did was nothing unusual under ordinary circumstances; and as to his breath failing him, that seems to be one of the many inventions of the very fertile minds of the scholiasts. If he did not have enough breath to utter a “diminished” vowel, how could he add ὀρῶ so as to be heard by thirty thousand people? And if he stopped to take breath, then he did *not* pass rapidly over the synaloephe. The fact may be that, getting out of breath he lowered his voice, thus making γαλήν out of γαλήν', and then took a breath and added ὀρῶ, which would complete the transformation, since the elision should not be complete where any pause is made. This, however, is a mere conjecture, and is not necessary to the explanation of the matter. The mistake on the part of the spectators was anyhow quite natural, because ὀρᾶν γαληνά was a forced and unnatural expression.

Fourthly, Ahrens observes that συναλοιφή does not denote *expulsion*, and that elision takes place before a pause, and at

the end of a verse, and even between two speakers. I have already spoken of the meaning of *συναλοιφή*; but here I shall discuss the subject more at length. That the word *ἐκθλιψις* was employed to designate elision is well known, and the only question is how early it was so used. I shall not attempt, however, to settle this question, for it is clear that it was so used sufficiently early to show that whatever it denoted had an existence in classic times. Draco enumerates seven kinds of synaloephe, among which he places *ἐκθλιψις*, which he defines thus: *καὶ ἐκθλιψις μὲν ἐστὶ ἐν ὃς φωνήεντος ἀπώλεια*, and illustrates by *ὑπ' ἐμοῦ* for *ὑπὸ ἐμοῦ*, although he defines synaloephe itself thus: *Συναλοιφή δὲ ἡ τοῦ προειρημένου καὶ ἐντελοῦς σύμπτυξις τε καὶ ἔνωσις*: a definition which shows how careless the ancient grammarians could be in their statements; and, in my opinion, they had crasis also in mind, or even exclusively in mind, when they appear to apply the word *συναλοιφή* to elision, except that when employing it as a *generic* term, they sometimes apply it specifically to elision, just as one may call a temporal sentence a *relative* sentence. Here is another statement of the subject: *Συναλοιφή ἐστὶ δύο συλλαβῶν κατὰ φωνήεντα ἔνωσις καταβολῇ τόνων. γίγνεται δὲ κατὰ τρόπους ἑπτὰ, ἀπλοῦς μὲν τρεῖς κατὰ ἐκθλιψιν, ἐπ' ἐμέ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐπὶ ἐμέ· κατὰ κρᾶσιν, τὰμὰ ἀντὶ τοῦ τὰ ἐμά· κατὰ συναίρεσιν, νηρηδες ἀντὶ τοῦ νηρηήδες. συνδέτους δὲ τέσσαρας, κατὰ ἐκθλιψιν καὶ συναίρεσιν, ἐμοῦ ποδῦνει ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐμοὶ ὑποδύνει· κατὰ κρᾶσιν καὶ συναίρεσιν, ὀπόλος ἀντὶ τοῦ ὀ αἰπόλος· κατὰ ἐκθλιψιν καὶ κρᾶσιν, κ' ἄγ' ἀντὶ τοῦ καὶ ἐγώ· κατὰ ἐκθλιψιν καὶ κρᾶσιν καὶ ἀφαιρέσιν, ἐν τᾷθιοπίᾳ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐν τῇ Αἰθιοπίᾳ*. Here it is evident that the grammarian by *ἐκθλιψις* means *total expulsion*, for in *ἐπ' ἐμέ* he says we have *ἐκθλιψις*, and in *κα' ἐγώ* both *ἐκθλιψις* and *κρᾶσις*; that is, the *ι* in *καὶ* being elided, we have *κα' ἐγώ* which then suffers *κρᾶσις*; and no one will deny that this *ι* was totally suppressed. Hephaestion therefore rightly distinguishes between *συνεκφώνησις*, by which *πλέων* (Il. A. 183) is reduced to one syllable, and synaloephe (generic, including elision), by which a vowel is rejected, as *ῶχ' ἐκατόγχειρον* (Il. A. 402), *θῖν' ἐφ' ἁλός* (Il. A. 350). But these two processes would have been the same, if elision had only been a diminution. And the scholiast on this passage does not err when he says: *Διαφέρει δὲ συναλοιφή συνεκφώνησεως*,

ἡγουν συνίζησεως. ἡ μὲν γὰρ συναλοιφὴ ὥς γράφεται οὕτω καὶ ἐκφωνεῖται· ἡ δὲ συνίζησις οὐχ ὥς γράφεται ἐκφωνεῖται, ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ βαίνειν τὰς δύο συλλαβὰς ὁμοῦ ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ μέτρου θεραπειᾶς συνεκφωνεῖ· διὸ καὶ συνίζησις λέγεται κτέ.

§ 2. So far my arguments have been negative. I shall now present my own views, and support them with a brief discussion of the evidence in their favor.

In prose, as is well known, the Greeks tolerated hiatus, except that some rhetoricians tried to banish it in artificial compositions, an illustration of which we have in the orations of Isocrates. But then, if they chose, they could elide. Hence we draw the important conclusion that the Greeks *could elide or not elide, as suited their convenience*. One might assume this as a matter of course, but Cicero, while testifying to this peculiarity of Greek, denies that the same privilege exists in Latin. He says (Or. 44, 152): "Sed Graeci viderint: nobis ne si cupiamus quidem distrahere voces conceditur," etc. But in poetry the Greeks avoided hiatus for the most part, and in tragic trimeters banished it entirely, except (apparently) after *τί*. as AEsCH. Sup. 306, *τί οἶν*; SOPH. Philoct. 917, *τί εἶπας*; and rarely after *εἶ* in close combinations. But frequently it was difficult to prevent a word which ended with a vowel from preceding one beginning with a vowel, even when there was a pause between them. In that case they did not totally expel the vowel, nor even necessarily reduce it to inappreciable quantity. Whenever this happened the elision was indicated as if total, while in recitation the elided vowel was either pronounced in full or merely diminished, just as the sense required or permitted. Another instance of partial, or apparent elision is where an *emphatic monosyllable* apparently loses its vowel, as EURIP. Tro. 945: *οὐ σ', ἀλλ' ἐμωτὴν τοῦπὶ τῷδ' ἐρήσομαι*. So Alcest. 984. Also where the sense would be obscured, as Herc. Fur. 972: *ἄλλος ἄλλος', ἐς πέπλους ὁ μὲν μητρὸς κτέ*. Cf. SOPH. Elect. 1499, EURIP. Ion 3, etc., etc. And thus it came about that if for any reason they desired it, *they felt themselves at liberty merely to diminish a vowel, even when there was nothing but metrical considerations to prevent its total expulsion*. This fact is of special importance in determining certain effects of elision

in the construction of verses—a subject on which I propose to present a paper at some future time.

But that vowels could be, and actually were, entirely expelled by elision, is shown by the following considerations :

1. When the second word begins with an aspirated vowel, then the aspirate affects the final consonant of the first word, if it can be aspirated without changing its character, as *νόχῳ ὀλην, ἐφ' ἡμῖν, θώραχ' ὅπως*, which seems to me impossible if the elided vowel was pronounced ever so little, for then it would have separated the consonant from the aspirate. This, it is true, does not happen in Herodotus ; but then in H. it does not happen in *compound words*, like *ἀπίημι*, where all admit total elision.

2. If the ultima has the accent, it goes back to the next syllable when elision takes place, and enclitics retain their accent when elision takes place before them. This would hardly have been the case if the elided syllable had only been diminished, for the Greek accent was merely an elevation of the voice, and not stress. (This recession of the accent from an elided ultima is found in some of the examples used by Ahrens to prove that the vowel was *not* entirely suppressed, as *ἔσθλ', σέμν'*.) We have in the Greek language itself an instance of the accent *remaining* on a merely diminished vowel (or at least not seeking another syllable), and that is in aphaeresis, as *ἐκείνῳ ὤωκεν* or *ἐκείνῳ ὤωκεν*. Thiersch ridicules such accents, calling them “*accentus aëroβαστούντας*,” but if he had put on his phrontistic spectacles he would have detected a *κρεμάθρα* on which they ride ; in other words, the omission of the vowel in this case only indicated its diminution to inappreciable quantity, while the accent still remained on it, just as in Sanskrit we find an accent (the *svarita*) partly on *v* and *j*, although these not only fail to make syllables themselves, but even do not lengthen a short syllable, as in *sàar, kva, naḍjas* (Bopp, Crit. Gram. § 30, 1); and similarly even in Greek where an accented vowel suffers synizesis, as in *Αἰνέας* (Rhes. 85), *ἀριστέων* (Alcest. 921), *τευχέων* (Androm. 167), *ὀσπέων* (Tro. 1177). So *Οἰλέως, Ἀχιλλέως*, and in HOM. Od. *Αἰγυπτίους*, with hundreds of instances everywhere. In

all these the accented vowels become virtual consonants. This view is further sustained by the fact that when the first syllable of a word is entirely lost, the accent on it is removed to the next syllable, as in the Homeric βάλλε for ἐβάλλε, where no vowel precedes. Corssen, indeed, denies that such forms have lost the augment, but G. Curtius more successfully maintains that they have. But as it is important to establish the position that in aphaeresis the vowel was thus diminished and yet retained the accent, I must not leave unnoticed the fact that Thiersch, Buttmann, and others deny the existence of aphaeresis, and assert that all the apparent instances of it really belong to crasis. This view, though, cannot stand in the face of the following facts:

First, such combinations as δύναμαι ἴγώ, which are frequently found in MSS., and are not wanting in inscriptions, would have to be written δυναμάγώ, with omission of ι and contraction of α with ε. *Secondly*, when the word suffering aphaeresis begins with an *aspirated* vowel, the consonant beginning the syllable preceding would become exposed to the aspirate as in θοιμάτιον for τὸ ἱμάτιον, θῆμέρα for τῇ ἡμέρα, θάρερα for τῇ ἐρέρα (once ἄτέρα), whilst in reality we find such examples as αὕτη ἴτέρα (ARISTOPH. LYS. 736) for αὕτη ἐτέρα, which, by *crasis*, would become αὐθιτέρα (αὐθάτέρα?). I am willing, indeed, to concede that *some* instances of aphaeresis, as found in the texts, are to be written otherwise, as χῆ γχουσα (LYS. 48), which ought to be written χῆγχουσα, for the article loves crasis, and I suspect that the usual way of writing these words is due to the fact that the double crasis seemed rather bold, and obscured the words. Felton's ἄ λαβεν (Clouds 1268) with long ἄ is certainly wrong. *Thirdly*, aphaeresis sometimes takes place after a long pause where crasis is impossible, as Clouds 1354: ἐγὼ φράσω· ἴπειδ' ἡ κτέ.; Philoct. 591: λέγω· ἴπει τοῦτον κτέ.; Rhesus 157: ἤξω· ἴπει τοῦτοις κτέ.; Iph. in Aul. 719: μέλλω· ἴπει ταύτη κτέ., etc., etc. It is sometimes regarded as taking place at the beginning of a verse, but a careful examination of all the Greek dramatic poetry convinces me that this may have been a mere omission of the augment of verbs (which frequently occurs in ῥήσεις ἀγγελικαί), although

in the great majority of cases the preceding verse ends with a vowel. This vowel is sometimes short, as in Oed. Colon. 1605-6, and sometimes we find a consonant, as Oed. Rex 1248-49. I am not so sure, however, that aphaeresis may not take place after a short vowel; and I shall presently have occasion to cite a case of similar aphaeresis in Latin. But to return:

3. Diphthongs are frequently elided, and especially in the verbal ending *-ai*. Now can a whole diphthong be reduced to inappreciable quantity? It is difficult to reduce a diphthong even to a short syllable; nor is there any reason why the first vowel should be diminished unless the second is entirely removed, so that those who assert that elision is mere diminution are compelled to affirm that *ι* is dropped entirely and *α* diminished; but if *ι* in a diphthong can be dropped entirely, why cannot any elidable vowel be thus dropped, as *α* in ἄλγεα ἔθηκεν, γαλήνῃ ὁρῶ? One might reply that the *ι* becomes a sort of consonant or semi-vowel, like *y*; and I believe that this is what actually happens when a diphthong is *shortened*, as in οὐκ ἔσται οὐ τρυγών, where *ι* = *y*, and in αἰετοῦ ἐν νεφέλῃσι, and ἴζευ ἔμεϊτο, where *υ* = *w*, since *υ* is never elided, the well-known exception in a quoted oracle in Herodotus being only apparent. But if this is what becomes of the second vowel in case of *elision* of a diphthong, there is no reason at all for the shortening of the first vowel, as there is no longer hiatus. In such instances, therefore, as κοιμᾶσθ' ἐν πόλει (for κοιμᾶσθαι), κολάσ' ἔξεστι (for κολάσαι), δοῦν' ἔνεστι (for δοῦναι), γῆμ' ἐπῆρε (for γῆμαι), δέομ' ἐγώ (for δέομαι), necessarily the second vowel, and in fact the first, too, was elided, unless for some special reason it was desirable to make the first audible.

4. Epicharmus, as quoted by Athenaeus (VIII, p. 338, d; see Ahrens, de Crasi et Aphaer. p. 2) plays upon γ' ἔρανος and γέρανος, from which it appears that the *ε* in γέ was suppressed. Aristophanes (Clouds 1273) appears also to play upon ἀν' ὄνου and ἀπὸ νοῦ. Further, DION. HAL. (De Comp. Verb. c. 11) calls κτυπεῖτ' (for κτυπεῖτε) "two syllables." I am not disposed to make much of this, as an inappreciable vowel might be omitted in counting syllables metrically.

5. The words ὅταν, ὁπότε, γάρ, γοῦν, etc., for ὅτε ἄν, ὁπότε ἄν, γε ἄν, γε οὖν, etc., show that the vowel was entirely suppressed; and after they had been a long time in use, the combinations began to be regarded as single words. This might happen, it is true, merely from long juxtaposition, as we have in Latin, (where elision does not appear to have been total) *tantōpere*, *magnōpere*, for *tantō ὅpere*, *magnō ὅpere*. But this is much rarer than in Greek, and we have in Latin two vowels united into a diphthong, as in *neuter*, *neutiquam*, *deinde*, etc.

6. Finally, if elision had been only a diminution of the vowel, as in Latin, it would not have been subject to so strict limitations, but would have been as universal as it was in Latin. But, as is well known, elision in Greek was strictly forbidden under certain circumstances. For instance, α, ι, and ο in monosyllables were not elided (except α in σά); and υ was never elided at all. The seeming exception in Herodotus (VIII, 220) ἄστ' ἐρικυδέες should most probably be ἄστνυ 'ρικυδέες (a sort of aphaeresis after a short vowel), or perhaps the oracular poet or priest was at his wit's end for a verse, and admitted *diminution* where *expulsion* was not tolerated. When υ closes a diphthong, it does, indeed, seem to be elided; but in that case, as I have already said, it was probably pronounced somewhat like *w*, just as ô in Sanskrit before a vowel becomes av, where υ was, no doubt, pronounced like *w*. Further, ὅτε and περί do not suffer elision, possibly because they would then sound like ὅτε (with its ε elided) and περί, which would not be the case if their vowels were sounded ever so little. Some words, however, with *long vowels*, did suffer a partial elision; but this is one of those exceptions that prove a rule; for if *all* elisions were only partial, then μὴ οὐ (as one syllable) should be written μ' οὐ, and would be an ordinary case of elision. Nor is it crasis, for then it would be μῶ (cf. μῶν for μὴ οὖν); and moreover the combination may occur when a slight pause intervenes, as Oed. Tyr. 944: τέθνηκεν· εἰ δὲ μὴ, αὐτὸς ἀξιώθαι, and also where crasis would utterly obscure the sense, as Trach. 85: ἡνίκ' ἦ σεώσμεθα | κείνου βίον σώσαντος, ἢ οἰχόμεσθ' ἅμα. The contraction of μὴ οὐ into μῶ would itself be rather obscure; but if so in

writing, then certainly also in speaking; and that contractions of the sort, when made in speaking, were also indicated in writing, is shown by $\chi\acute{o}\nu$ for $\kappa\alpha\iota \acute{o} \acute{\epsilon}\nu$, EURIP. Heracl. 173; $\wp\acute{\omega}\pi\lambda' \acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{\iota}\epsilon\nu\alpha\iota$ for $\tau\acute{\alpha} \acute{\omicron}\pi\lambda\alpha \acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{\iota}\epsilon\nu\alpha\iota$, Birds 449; and even $\kappa\alpha\iota$ for $\kappa\alpha\iota \alpha\iota$, Lysist. 1105. We have, however, an instance of crasis not indicated in writing, in EURIP. Orest. 599: $\epsilon\acute{\iota} \mu\grave{\eta} \acute{o} \kappa\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\alpha\varsigma \rho\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota \mu\epsilon \mu\grave{\eta} \wp\alpha\nu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$, unless with Witzschel and others we omit \acute{o} , or admit synizesis of a long vowel with a short one, resulting in a long syllable.

Further instances of non-elidable vowels are found in the genitive ending $-οιο, αο$, and to a great extent in the dative ending $-ι$; and third singular endings in $-ε$ are not elided before $\acute{\alpha}\nu$, unless we admit $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\chi' \acute{\alpha}\nu \mu\acute{\epsilon}\tau\rho\omicron\nu$ (Ion 354); for $\sigma\upsilon\nu\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\chi' \acute{\alpha}\nu$ (Alcest. 901) is an impossible conjecture, and $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\acute{\alpha}\nu\wp\alpha\nu' \acute{\alpha}\nu$ (SOPH. Elect. 914), though desirable as to the sense, is not the MSS. reading. Other instances of forbidden elision might be cited. All this proves conclusively that elision was recognized as having power to remove a vowel entirely; for, otherwise, there was no reason why elision might not have been as general as it was in Latin, where the restrictions, as far as they exist, merely have reference to too great a mutilation of the word, and were a refinement of artificial writers. The vowels which could not be elided entirely in Greek, were, for the most part, not even allowed to suffer diminution to inappreciable quantity (Latin elision), because this was a modified form of ordinary elision, and was *written* as elision, i. e. the vowel was omitted in writing, except in those few cases where the elision was *never* total, as $\mu\grave{\eta} ο\acute{\upsilon}$. An investigation of these latter cases would lead to a discussion of synizesis and synaeresis, which is foreign to the object of this paper.

§ 3. These arguments seem to prove that vowels could be and frequently were entirely expelled by elision. It now remains to be shown that not unfrequently they were, for special reasons, only partially elided; and indeed they sometimes had nearly or quite their full time, although they counted for nothing in the structure of the verse.

In the first place, elision takes place before a strong pun-

tuation, as (Birds 990) οὐκ εἶ θύραζ'; ἐς κόρακας κτέ. EURIP. Androm. 459:

κτείνεις μ'. ἀπόκτειν'· ὡς ἀθώπεντόν γέ σε.

SOPH. Elect. 662:

τάδ' ἐστίν, ὦ ξέν'. αὐτός ἥκασας καλῶς.

Cf. also 671, 1041, 1112, 1470, etc.

I am not disposed to attach much importance to elision at the end of a verse, as in Birds 1716:

χωρεῖ, καλὸν θέαμα· θυμαμάτων δ'
αἰθραι διαψαίρουσι κτέ.,

and Oed. Col. 1164:

σοὶ φασὶν αὐτὸν ἐς λόγους ἐλθεῖν μολόντ'
αἰτεῖν ἀπελθεῖν τ' ἀσφαλῶς τῆς δεῦρ' ὁδοῦ:

for I doubt whether this ever happens unless the sense requires the verses to be closely connected together; and that being the case, the two verses can be read continuously as one long verse, and the vowel can be dropped.

Again, elision takes place *between two speakers*, as Birds 846, 1015:

EYEAN. οἴμωζε παρ' ἐμ'. ΠΙΣΘ. ἴθ', ὦγάθ', οἱ πέμπω σ' ἐγώ.
ΠΙΣΘ. μὰ τὸν Δι' οὐ δῆτ'. MET. ἀλλὰ πῶς;

So SOPH. Elect. 1431:

OP. εἰσορᾶτε ποῦ
τὸν ἄνδρ'; ΕΛ. ἐφ' ἡμῖν οὗτος ἐκ προαστίου—.

Ibid. 1502:

OP. ἀλλ' ἔρφ'. ΑΓΓ. ὑφηγοῦ. OP. σοὶ βαδιστεον πάρος.

Elisions of the sort just now mentioned—those at a full stop *not* between two speakers—are comparatively rare; for there was something harsh about them; and although we may use the interrogation point or the period, still the *pause* is really short in most cases. That they were in some measure unpleasant is shown by the fact that Isocrates, who did not tolerate hiatus in his orations, also banishes this sort of elision—a thing which he could do more effectually than the poets, who were somewhat trammelled in the arrangement of their words by

metrical considerations. But elision between two speakers does not appear to have been avoided at all; for, in fact, it was not a real elision. The second actor began to speak just as the first one struck his last syllable. To this it may be objected that the same thing could have happened just as well, if the first speaker closed with a consonant; and this is certainly true. But there would have been nothing to indicate that it was to be so recited, and, as I have already said, verses were so composed that, when written, they looked perfect, which could not be done if the first speaker's final syllable had been disregarded when it was closed by a consonant. We find something analogous to this effort to make the verse appear perfect in the classic French drama, where, without affecting its pronunciation, the mere spelling of a word is sometimes altered, so as to make it *look* like the word with which it rhymes, as *Le Cid*, v. 771, where *voi* (for *vois*) rhymes with *toi*, and 851, where *voi* rhymes with *moi*. Somewhat analogous is also the method of indicating a pause at the end of a piece of music when the last measure is incomplete.

In view of all this it is safe to assert that elision between two speakers was relatively more frequent than at a full stop in a speech of one person. (I say *relatively*, because this sort of elision only has a chance to occur when a verse is divided between two persons.) In fact it was not avoided at all, but sometimes appears even to have been sought, as it gave one actor an opportunity to fall in before the other had entirely finished his last word—a thing to be desired when the dialogue is animated, or for any reason rapid. If any one doubts this let him examine such passages as EURIP. *Orest.* 1598–1612, where in fifteen lines this elision occurs seven times.

These arguments prove conclusively that elision was sometimes only partial, and sometimes even only apparent, the vowel omitted in writing being pronounced in full, but counting for nothing in the structure of the verse.

§ 4. Although it was more especially designed to investigate *Greek* elision in this paper, it will not be irrelevant to append a few remarks on elision in Latin. It is conceded by

nearly all that elision in this language was only partial. Hence it was subject to less strict laws than in Greek, and hiatus is more rarely admitted, it being easier to avoid it. Indeed Cicero (Or. 44, 152), as quoted before, says that the Romans were not allowed to neglect elision even if they desired to; and then finds fault with poets for doing it. But this very fact that poets did sometimes allow it, shows that the law Cicero announces was not without exception, and of course it was no physical necessity, but merely convenience and usage. Yet Cicero's remark shows that in *prose it was practically universal*. Such words as *neuter*, *deinde*, etc., show that elision was not total, at least, in some cases where there was nothing to prevent its being total if it ever was; and those cases where the vowel was entirely lost (*tantopere*, *magnopere*, *animadvertere*, etc.) are mere results of long usage, the vowel having been slightly pronounced at first, just as we say "extrordinary" instead of "extra-ordinary." In *tantopere* and *magnopere* this process was hastened by the identity of the two vowels brought in contact, "tanto-opere," as elision and contraction are more necessary under these circumstances. This is illustrated by the Greek second declension in the genitive plural, which contracted before the existence of the law that a long ultima should prevent the accent from falling on the antepenult; while the same contraction did not happen in the first declension until after this period, the vowels not being so similar; thus λόγων became λόγων, while μούσων remained. Afterwards the long ultima removed the accent, and then they said λόγων, μουσάων (an extant form); and finally μουσάων contracted into μουσῶν. Similarly *nihil* became *nil*, and *mihī*, *mī*; but we must not carry the illustrations too far; for phenomena from *within* words, simple or genuinely compound, will not always hold for separate words; and *tantopere* and *magnopere* are not to be regarded as genuine compounds, such as *cogere*, *degere*, in which *crasis* seems to have been employed. (Corssen, by the way, Ausspr. Voc. Beton. II, 889, writes "tantópere," or possibly his printer did it for him.) And so in *mihī*, *nihil*, the process was different from that in *tanto opere*, but they

illustrate the aversion of the vocal organs to a consecutive *repetition* of a vowel. But of genuine crasis between two words, not combined into a genuine compound, I know of no example in Latin. In fact, elision being only partial, and so being allowable under almost all circumstances, there was no need of crasis; and the nearest approach we have to it is what we find in *degere*, *cogere* (just mentioned), further examples of which are *dēesse* (two syllables), *dēerrare* (three syllables). in which Velius Longus (p. 2227) says the *e* or *ee* was long (by nature), which of course we should expect, as the preposition sometimes formed a syllable to itself. Contractions such as *amatast*, *integratiost*, are not crasis, but a species of aphaeresis, as is shown by Tibullus (1, 9, 53, and 77):

at te qui puerum donis corrūpĕrĕ's ausus—
blanditiasne meas aliis tu vĕndĕrĕ's ausus.

The later Roman grammarians speak of elision as if it were a total expulsion of the vowel; but their authority is not of any importance. The name "*elision*," it is true, strictly interpreted, would imply total removal; but the Roman grammarians employed terminology that was adapted to Greek, and sometimes even mistranslated Greek terms. So we now speak, and I have just been speaking of "*elision*" in Latin; and while doing so, I have been trying to show that it is not *elision*, but *diminution*.

But there are good reasons for believing that the particles *-que*, *-ve*, *-ne* lost their vowels entirely through elision; and *-ne* is sometimes written without its vowel even before a consonant; just as *face*, *duce*, *dice* lost their *e*, and even *cave* (being much used) lost its *e* sometimes, as shown by Cicero's well-known remark implying similarity of sound between *caunēas* and *cave ne eas*. The elision of these particles will come up in my next paper.

Briefly, then, to sum up the whole matter:

1. In Greek, elision was the total suppression of a vowel; but it *could* be only the partial suppression, and sometimes was *required* to be only partial, or even merely apparent.

2. In Latin, elision was the partial suppression of a vowel; but in a few special instances it was total.